

A scenic landscape photograph of a snow-capped mountain peak, likely Mount Rainier, in the background. In the middle ground, a city with various buildings and houses is visible, situated on a hillside. The foreground is dominated by a large body of water, possibly a bay or lake, with a small boat visible on the left side. The sky is filled with soft, golden light, suggesting a sunrise or sunset.

One Washington Current Financial System Assessment

Table of Contents

1.0	Deliverable Overview	3
1.1	Purpose	3
1.2	Key Question	3
1.3	Key Considerations.....	3
2.0	Executive Summary	4
3.0	Introduction	5
3.1	Scope	5
3.2	Methodology	5
4.0	Recommendations	9
5.0	Next Steps	11
A.	Appendix A: Inventory of In-Scope Systems and Applications	12
B.	Appendix B: State Staff Who Completed Surveys	17

1.0 Deliverable Overview

1.1 Purpose

The Current Financial System Assessment engaged business and IT staff from sixteen agencies to evaluate and assess the functional and technical attributes of current financial systems to inform the development of a preliminary list of current financial systems that will be replaced by an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and those that will not be replaced and will interface with the new system.

1.2 Key Question

The Current Financial System Assessment seeks to answer the following question:

What current financial systems will be replaced through Washington's ERP solution, and which will remain but will need to interface with the new ERP?

1.3 Key Considerations

The development of this deliverable has taken into consideration the following:

- The Current Financial System Assessment leveraged the 2013 Auditor's Report, and particularly the data gathering and the analysis that supported that document.
- The Current Financial System Assessment is not intended to be a comprehensive analysis of every financial system across the enterprise, but rather focuses on the majority of financial systems that have a significant impact on the State's core financials.
- The Current Financial System Assessment will coordinate analysis and share findings with separate efforts underway across the State, including the OCIO Inventory of Legacy Systems.
- The Current Financial System Assessment includes analysis of those systems and applications for which agencies provided information.
- Input to the Current Financial System Assessment was self-reported by agency functional and technical owners, and not validated externally. Additional analysis will be conducted on these systems in the subsequent phase of work to address any gaps in information.
- The Current Financial System Assessment deliverable meets the requirement defined in Contract K2636 in the Compensation Section, as well as in the Statement of Work, Section 5.1, related to Phase 1, Deliverable #2.

2.0 Executive Summary

As the State of Washington examines the potential value of an ERP implementation to replace the State's core financial systems, a key first step is to assess the landscape of current financial systems to identify critical strategic choices available to the State. The Current Financial System Assessment engaged agency business and IT staff in a process for evaluating the health of the State's current financial applications to inform the development of a preliminary list of financial systems that will be replaced by an ERP system and those that will not be replaced but will interface with the new system.

This analysis provides valuable input to strategic and ERP planning-related decisions that State leaders will need to make ahead of an ERP implementation. Based on the input provided by 14 agencies, we were able to provide our initial recommendations for the applications as detailed below.

Recommendation: Based on this assessment of the State's current financial systems, our recommendations are as follows:

- The State should replace 138 of the 170 systems identified as in-scope for this assessment with the ERP system.
- Of the remaining 32 systems:
 - 19 will need to interface with the new ERP.
 - 5 systems have been decommissioned recently.
 - 8 systems will be replaced by the State's Time, Leave and Attendance (TLA) System, currently under development.

Moving forward, additional analysis will be conducted on these systems in the subsequent phase of work to inform the One Washington business case analysis.

3.0 Introduction

The Current Financial System Assessment engaged agency business and IT staff in a process for evaluating the health of the State's current financial applications, and the analysis provides valuable input to strategic and ERP planning-related decisions that State leaders will need to make ahead of an ERP implementation. For the first phase of this project, we will provide our initial recommendations on what applications are strong candidates to be replaced by an ERP system and which ones may need to interface to an ERP system.

3.1 Scope

The scope for this analysis includes current financial systems and applications used by the following agencies:

- Administrative Office of the Courts
- Department of Corrections
- Department of Ecology
- Department of Enterprise Services
- Department of Fish & Wildlife
- Department of Health
- Department of Labor & Industries
- Department of Natural Resources
- Department of Revenue
- Department of Social and Health Services
- Department of Transportation
- Employment Security Department
- Health Care Authority
- Office of Financial Management
- Office of the Insurance Commissioner
- Office of the State Treasurer

In total, 170 systems and applications were identified as in-scope for this analysis, as determined by their role in managing agencies' financial functions. A full inventory of systems is provided in Appendix A. These systems include agency systems as well as enterprise systems, such as the Agency Financial Reporting System (AFRS). Information provided for the development of this assessment will be incorporated into the subsequent phase of analysis to inform the One Washington business case.

3.2 Methodology

Functional owners/users and members of each in scope agency's IT organization were engaged to respond to a survey for each current financial system or application currently in use by their respective organization. The original list of systems and applications leveraged the May 2013 State Auditor's Office Performance Audit, *Creating a 21st-century Financial Management System in Washington*, and each in scope agency was asked to identify any new financial applications or any other updates should be made to the inventory.

Functional and technical questions to determine financial application health were identified, and business and IT staff from the agencies were identified to answer the questions for each application in-scope. Each agency's functional and technical owners answered a Microsoft Excel questionnaire containing nine questions each, focused on gathering data about agencies' perspectives on the dimensions described in Sections 3.3 and 3.4.

Functional Health

ID	Functional Health Dimensions	Description of Questions
1	Agility & Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ease of Introducing of Enhancements and/or New Products/Services - Indicates how easily (effort/cost) the Application can adapt to additional product innovations or changes in business requirements.
2	Application Functionality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current Functionality/Suitability - Indicates the completeness of the set of functions/features that are provided by the Application for current requirements. ▪ Level of Integration - Indicates the degree to which the Application is integrated with other systems, and to what extent manual data transfers or re-keying of information is required, or to what extent multiple systems are used to perform daily activities.
3	Business Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regulatory Compliance - Rates how well the Application implements and supports current regulatory requirements and legal mandates.
4	Performance & Usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability/Reliability - Indicates the degree to which the Application is available when needed and reliable in operation.
5	Product Innovation & Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate Platform For Continued Product Innovation – Asks for agency input regarding whether the Application is built upon the appropriate platform for continued product innovation to determine if the Application can be built upon (grown) to support additional products and services. ▪ Ability to Support Anticipated Growth - Provides perception that this Application will be able to meet growth expectations for next 3-5 years (Transactions, Customers, Users, Database/Information).
6	Strategic Direction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost Effectiveness – Provides agency assessment of the overall cost of ownership of the Application in terms of costs vs. value. ▪ Future Adequacy in Meeting Business Needs - Taking all factors (design, innovation, functionality, technology, performance, etc.) into consideration, provides agency view of the functional adequacy of this Application for supporting future business requirements.

Technical Health

ID	Functional Health Dimensions	Description of Questions
1	Operability & Supportability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operability / Manageability - Indicates the ease to run and operate this Application. For example, does it require minimal operator intervention? ▪ Skills Base – Provides agency input regarding the extent to which the organization has the skills required to support and/or develop improvements to this Application.
2	Performance & Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability / Reliability - Indicates the degree to which the Application is available when needed and reliable in operation (e.g., Do outages occur and are re-runs required or are there any other abnormal circumstances?).
3	Scalability & Adaptability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ease of Incorporating New Requirements or Making Changes - Indicates the ease with which it is possible to change (e.g., current or new requirements, configuration changes, etc.) this Application and determine the effect this will have on other programs/applications.
4	Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Security Controls - Rates to what extent the application has the controls in place to prevent unauthorized access, whether accidental or not, to systems and data.
5	Strategic Direction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compliance to Enterprise Standards - Indicates the degree to which the application conforms to the Enterprise Architecture design standards. ▪ Technology Lifecycle Phase – Provides insight into the current phase in lifecycle of the technology of this application.
6	Technology Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modern/Mainstream Technologies – Provides agency input for characterizing the technologies that are used to build and support the application.
7	Vendor Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External Support - Indicates the quality of the vendor support for this packaged application in terms of consultancy, help line responsiveness, reliability and ability to solve problems.

Of the 170 systems in-scope for this analysis, 51 of them were enterprise systems utilized by multiple agencies managed by the Department of Enterprise Services. For these systems, the Department of Enterprise Services completed both functional and technical surveys given their role managing and operating enterprise-wide systems.

Agencies had five business days to complete and return the surveys to the One Washington team between March 19 and March 26, 2014. Analysis of the data was conducted by the One Washington team, resulting in the findings provided in this deliverable and this information will also provide input into key Phase 2 deliverables.

These inputs provided the basis for determining what applications could be potentially replaced by an ERP financial system, and which applications would need to be interfaced with the new ERP financial system. This information will be one key estimating factor used to complete the phasing and timeline analysis work in Phase 2. The diversity of the agencies selected and the amount of applications included in this scope provide a very good basis of estimate. The team will use the application information gathered during Phase 1 and extrapolate information for the rest of the State agencies not included in this assessment.

If a decision is made by the State to implement a new financial ERP system, detailed requirements and analysis will be done to determine exactly what current financials systems will be replaced and which ones will need to be interfaced to the new ERP system.

4.0 Recommendations

Based on this assessment of the State's current financial systems, our recommendations are as follows:

- The State should replace 138 of the 170 systems in-scope for this assessment with the ERP system.
- Of the remaining 32 systems:
 - 19 will need to interface with the new ERP.
 - 5 systems were determined to be candidates for decommissioning in the near future, or already have been decommissioned.
 - 8 systems will be replaced by the State's Time, Leave and Attendance (TLA) System, currently under development.

These recommendations reflect the aggregation of the following agency-specific recommendations:

Agency	Number of Systems Recommended to be Replaced by ERP	Number of Systems Recommended to Interface with ERP
Department of Enterprise Services & Office of Financial Management	44	3
Department of Corrections	5	2
Department of Ecology	9	1
Department of Fish & Wildlife	21	-
Department of Health	10	3
Department of Labor & Industries	8	1
Department of Natural Resources	3	2
Department of Revenue	3	-
Department of Social and Health Services	12	4
Department of Transportation	16	1
Employment Security Department	6	1
Health Care Authority	1	-
Office of State Treasurer	0	1
Total	138	19

These recommendations are made on the following basis:

- **Systems to include in-scope for the ERP system:** Based on our experience with leading ERPs and typical functionality included. Agency financial systems that have functionality that can be replaced by modern ERP systems were placed in this category. Other factors such as current system or process pain in the agency, as well as systems coming to end of life, were also taken into consideration.

- **Systems to interface with the new ERP:** Based on our experience with implementing ERP systems and the input provided by the State. There are some agency financial systems that do very unique types of transactions and processes that may not fit will into a Statewide ERP system. In these cases, an interface will be estimated if information from these systems needs to be interfaced with an ERP financial system.
- **Systems decommissioned since the 2013 Performance Audit field work:** Based on input directly from the agencies.
- **Systems to be replaced by TLA System:** Based on input from the agencies and known functionality usually found in a Time and Attendance system. Estimates for interfacing the TLA system with a new ERP financial system will be included in the Phase 2 estimates.

From this initial Current Financial Systems Assessment, we have concurred with much of the information contained in Section 2, Inventory of State Administrative Systems of the May 2013 Office of the State Auditor's Performance Audit, *Creating a 21st-century Financial Management System in Washington*. There are many current financial systems that can be replaced by a new ERP financial system and agencies seem excited by the prospect of upgrading their financials systems and having much tighter integration with an ERP system to enable them to meet their business and reporting needs. Many of the agencies in this assessment have aging systems that come short of meeting their business needs and/or have systems that are coming to their technical end of life.

5.0 Next Steps

For purposes of sharing the detailed findings of this assessment beyond our recommendations, we will provide the detailed Functional and Technical survey questions, heat maps and other supporting analysis during Phase 2 of this project. This information will provide key inputs into the Phase and Staffing deliverables that will be created during Phase 2.

During Phase 2 of this project, the team will also get more information from the potential interfaces needed between the State's core ERP system and other agency financial systems that may need to share information.

A. Appendix A: Inventory of In-Scope Systems and Applications

ID	Application Name	Agency	Recommendation - Replace by ERP?	No Recommendation - Detail
1	Agency Financial Reporting System (AFRS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
2	Financial Toolbox	DES/OFM	Yes	
3	CAFR Production Database	DES/OFM	Yes	
4	Disclosure Form	DES/OFM	Yes	
5	Travel Expense Management System (TEMS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
6	Solomon AR	DES/OFM	Yes	
7	Disbursement Reporting System (DRS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
8	Time Management System (TMS)	DES/OFM	No	Replace by TLA*
9	AFRS Data Download System (ADDS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
10	Enterprise Reporting (ER)	DES/OFM	Yes	
11	Budget Development System (BDS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
12	Capital Asset Management System (CAMS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
13	Capital Budget System (CBS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
14	Client Services Contract Database (CSCD)	DES/OFM	Yes	
15	Cost Allocation System (CAS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
16	Enterprise Financial Reports	DES/OFM	Yes	
17	Personal Services Contract Database (PSCD)/ Sole Source Contracts Database (SSCD)	DES/OFM	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
18	The Allotment System (TALS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
19	Statewide Vendor File	DES/OFM	Yes	
20	Washington's Electronic Business Solution (WEBS)	DES/OFM	Yes	
21	Transportation Reporting and Accounting Information System (TRAINS)	DOT	Yes	
22	Construction Administration and Payments System (CAPS)	DOT	Yes	
23	Labor Collection / Payroll Expenditure Reporting (Labor)	DOT	No	Replace by TLA
24	Transportation Asset Reporting and Tracking System (TARTS)	DOT	Yes	
25	Consumable Inventory System (CIS)	DOT	Yes	
26	Minor Cap	DOT	Yes	
27	Purchase Card	DOT	Yes	
28	Construction Contracts Information System (CCIS)	DOT	Yes	
29	Capital Program Management System (CPMS)	DOT	Yes	
30	Contract Agreement Tracking System (CATS)	DOT	Yes	
31	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	DOT	Yes	
32	Work Order Authorization (WOA)	DOT	Yes	
33	Financial Information System (FIS)	DOR	Yes	
34	Inventory Control Systems (ICS)	DOR	Yes	
35	Travel Voucher System (TVS)	DOR	Yes	
36	Vehicle Mileage Tracking System (VMTS)	DFW	Yes	
37	Cash Receipts System	DFW	Yes	
38	Chart of Accounts (COA)	DFW	Yes	
39	Revenue Management (RM)	DFW	Yes	

ID	Application Name	Agency	Recommendation - Replace by ERP?	No Recommendation - Detail
40	Consumable Inventory	DFW	Yes	
41	State Utilities Database (SUDS)	DFW	Yes	
42	AP Travel	DFW	Yes	
43	Facilities Lease Payments	DFW	Yes	
44	Vendor and Contract Payments	DFW	Yes	
45	Central Phone Mgt. Systems	DFW	Yes	
46	Use Tax Database	DFW	Yes	
47	ASAP Federal Draw System	DFW	Yes	
48	EPIC Capital Asset System	DFW	Yes	
49	Agency Purchasing	DFW	Yes	
50	Contract & Payment System	DFW	Yes	
51	CAPS Financials	DFW	Yes	
52	Federal Aid & Funds Management System	DFW	Yes	
53	Capital Billing & Labor Cost System	DFW	Yes	
54	Web Works Fleet Management	DFW	Yes	
55	Indirect Cost Plan	DFW	Yes	
56	Wild System	DFW	Yes	
57	Accounts Receivable System (AR)	ECY	Yes	
58	Agency Data Database System (ADDS)	ECY	Yes	
59	CASHIERING	ECY	Yes	
60	Docket Management System (DMS)	ECY	No	Interface – Non-ERP System
61	Purchasing Tracking System (PTS)	ECY	Yes	
62	Computerized Auto Reporting System (CARS)	ECY	Yes	
63	Automated Leave eForm (ALF eForms)	ECY	No	Replace by TLA
64	Billing and Revenue Tracking System (BARTS)	ECY	Yes	
65	Contracts, Grants, & Loans Payables (CG&P)	ECY	Yes	
66	Grants Receivable Systems (GRS)	ECY	Yes	
67	Ecology Loan Tracking System (ELTS)	ECY	Yes	
68	Agency Billing System (ABS)	DES	Yes	
69	Computron A/R System (AXS-One)	DES	Yes	
70	A/R Reports	DES	Yes	
71	Cost Allocation Rate Program (CARP)	DES	Yes	
72	Electronic Voucher Form (EVF)	DES	Yes	
73	Performance Measurement System	DES	Yes	
74	Budget Toolbox	DES	Yes	
75	Assets/Assets 2000.mdb	DES	Yes	
76	Customer Data Sets	DES	Yes	
77	Solomon AR/GL	DES	Yes	
78	Technology Acquisition Services (TAS) (Leasing)	DES	No	Decommissioned
79	Warrant Cancellation	DES	Yes	
80	Technology Acquisition Services (TBS) (Brokering)	DES	No	Decommissioned
81	AP Imaging	DES	No	Interface – Non-ERP System
82	Kofax Ascent Capture	DES	No	Interface – Non-ERP System
83	CTS P&L	DES	Yes	

ID	Application Name	Agency	Recommendation - Replace by ERP?	No Recommendation - Detail
84	Application Extender	DES	Yes	
85	HRDIS (DSD Accounting)	DES	Yes	
86	Solomon (2 apps - TDS/OFM)	DES	Yes	
87	(D) Great Plains	DES	Yes	
88	Business Management System	DES	Yes	
89	Financial Contracts	DES	Yes	
90	FIRMS Database	DES	Yes	
91	Public Disclosure System	DES	Yes	
92	Purchasing and Contract Administration Purchase Orders	DES	Yes	
93	Purchasing Contract Management System	DES	Yes	
94	Contracts Database	DES	Yes	
95	Front Counter	L&I	Yes	
96	AIMS Vendor Pay system	L&I	Yes	
97	AIMS Cash Receipts	L&I	Yes	
98	Spending Plan Application (SPA)	L&I	Yes	
99	ARC	L&I	Yes	
100	FIRS	L&I	Yes	
101	Asset Tracking System (ATS)	L&I	Yes	
102	APS/ePlus	L&I	Yes	
103	IPS - Internet Payment Services	L&I	No	Interface – Unique Agency Function
104	TEAMS - Time Reporting	ESD	No	Replace by TLA
105	HRDB - Agency Data Mart	ESD	Yes	
106	FinancialDB - Agency Data Mart	ESD	Yes	
107	Cost Allocation (CAS)	ESD	Yes	
108	Fixed Assets (AKA Remedy)	ESD	Yes	
109	FOS - Field Order System	ESD	Yes	
110	Next Generation Tax System (NGTS)	ESD	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
111	Grants Management Manual Tracking	ESD	Yes	
112	ADDS Data	DOH	Yes	
113	ADDS Gopher	DOH	Yes	
114	ADDS Reporter	DOH	Yes	
115	Attendance Portal	DOH	No	Replace by TLA
116	Financial Contract Monitoring System (FCMS)	DOH	Yes	
117	ILRS	DOH	No	Interface – Unique Agency Function
118	ILRS On-line/Consumer payment	DOH	No	Interface – Unique Agency Function
119	JVXFER Revenue Windows Client	DOH	Yes	
120	NSF App	DOH	Yes	
121	Remit Plus Windows Client	DOH	No	Interface – Unique Agency Function
122	Windows Allotment Reporting Program (WARP)	DSHS	Yes	
123	Facilities Management System (FMS)	DSHS	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
124	Grant Management System (GMS)	DSHS	Yes	
125	Automated Clearing House Debit (ACH Debit)	DSHS	Yes	

ID	Application Name	Agency	Recommendation - Replace by ERP?	No Recommendation - Detail
126	Cash Adjustment Tool (CAT)	DSHS	Yes	
127	Cash Receipt Tool (CRT)	DSHS	Yes	
128	Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT)	DSHS	Yes	
129	Expert Remittance Processing System (Expert RPS)	DSHS	Yes	
130	Cash Processing System (PC Cash)	DSHS	Yes	
131	Collections and Accounts Receivable System (CARS)	DSHS	Yes	
132	TRACKS	DSHS	Yes	
133	EPMX	DSHS	Yes	
134	Advanced Maintenance Management System (AMMS)	DSHS	No	Interface – Unique Agency Function
135	Agency Contracts Database (ACD)	DSHS	No	Interface – Unique Agency Function
136	Purchasing Management Extra (PMX – 2)	DSHS	Yes	
137	FER	DSHS	No	Decommissioned
138	Oracle Financials	HCA	Yes	
139	EIS – Budget	DOC	No	Decommissioned
140	Data Cube - DW	DOC	No	Interface – Non-ERP System
141	AFRS Security Database	DOC	Yes	
142	G38 - DW	DOC	Yes	
143	TRACKS - Procurement	DOC	Yes	
144	Atlas	DOC	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
145	ALF	DOC	Yes	
146	Great Plains	DOC	Yes	
147	Nature	DNR	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
148	FES	DNR	Yes	
149	Cost Allocation System (CAS)	DNR	Yes	
150	FASTER	DNR	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
151	AMMS	DNR	Yes	
152	Labor Reporting System (LRS)	DNR	No	Replace by TLA
153	Executive Monitoring System (EXECMON)	DES/OFM	No	Decommissioned
154	Historical Summary System (HISTSUM)	DES/OFM	Yes	
155	Revenue Summary System (REVSUM)	DES/OFM	Yes	
156	Budget Summary System (WINSUM)	DES/OFM	Yes	
157	FCSR	DOH	Yes	
158	Leave Automation	DOH	No	Replace by TLA
159	Informatica.net (From DOT)	DOT	No	Interface – Non-ERP System
160	Great Plains (Ferries)	DOT	Yes	
161	Fleet Equipment	DOT	Yes	
162	Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT)	DSHS	No	Interface – Non-ERP System
163	Great Plains - 3rd Party Damages	DOT	Yes	
164	Fleet Equipment Management System (FEMS)	DOT	Yes	
165	Federal Aid Tracking System (FATS)	DOT	Yes	

ID	Application Name	Agency	Recommendation - Replace by ERP?	No Recommendation - Detail
166	Chart of Accounts	DOH	Yes	
167	Cost Allocation System	DOH	Yes	
168	Federal Grants Report	DOH	Yes	
169	Treasury Management System (TMS)	TRE	No	Interface – Specific Agency System
170	Leave and Attendance System**	DOR	No	Replace by TLA

* Interface with TLA system will be part of implementation estimated created during Phase 2. The TLA system is currently under development.

** DOR Leave and Attendance System was added after surveys were completed, and it was agreed that this system would not need a survey completed.

B. Appendix B: State Staff Who Completed Surveys

Agency	Contributors
Department of Enterprise Services (DES)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connie Dove ▪ Steve Sage ▪ Dave Thorson ▪ John Nutter ▪ Ki No ▪ John Zarebski ▪ Vonnie Tallon ▪ Marcy Belles ▪ Dale Abersold ▪ John Honnold ▪ Ross Gonedridge
Department of Health (DOH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dan Francis
Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jennifer Weand ▪ Bernie Triance ▪ Dan Francis ▪ Paul Cox
Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steve Young
Department of Corrections (DOC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jibu Jacob
Department of Revenue (DOR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Wissler ▪ Lucas Kenall
Department of Transportation (DOT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dick Schmidt ▪ Hrishikesh Churi ▪ Richard Norrell ▪ Cindy Kay ▪ Jennifer Heay ▪ Scott Kibler ▪ Dave Davis ▪ Dan Gasche ▪ Aaron Ward ▪ Jamie Langford ▪ Daren Guyant ▪ Tharmalingam "Brem" Bremjit ▪ Firas Makhoul ▪ Don Noble ▪ Maureen Larson ▪ Richard Daniels ▪ Thomas Westfall ▪ Laura Pate ▪ Jodie Stanton ▪ John Jeffreys

Agency	Contributors
Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Samreth Sam ▪ Kim Hewitt ▪ Reginald Lee ▪ Carl Ward ▪ Daniel Knutson-Bradac
Department of Ecology (ECY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kevin Barbee
Employment Security Department (ESD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hal Greenbaum ▪ Vonnie Tallon ▪ Jill Blais ▪ Ryan Leisinger ▪ Vicki DeBoer ▪ Jim Reitz ▪ Brenda Westfall
Health Care Authority (HCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Specht
Department of Labor and Industries (LNI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Penny Jenson ▪ Matthew Carrithers
Office of Financial Management (OFM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ricky Myers ▪ Mike Clark ▪ Don Morris ▪ Benjamin Guyer ▪ Dan Francis
Office of the Treasurer (TRE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marla Kentfield